

T802

.G 454

Conservation Resources
Lig-Free® Type I
Ph 8.5, Buffered

T802
G1254

EXPOSITIONS EXPOSED.

SPEECH

OF

Amuel Callahan
HON. S. S. COX,

OF NEW YORK,

IN THE

15 / HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES,

NOVEMBER 19, 1877.



Life is like the Olympian games, where some came to obtain honor by joining and triumphing in the contest, many more to make money out of the requirements of the unusual assemblage; but the happiest of all were those who had no other interest but as lookers-on.

WASHINGTON.

1877.

[Government printing office]

T802
G1U54

S P E E C H
OF
H O N . S . S . C O X .

The House being in Committee of the Whole, (Mr. SPRINGER in the chair,) and having under consideration the joint resolution (H. R. No. 48) in relation to the international industrial exposition to be held in Paris in 1878—

Mr. COX, of New York, said :

Mr. CHAIRMAN: It is with regret that I oppose what might seem the aggrandizement of our country by a foreign exhibition of its products. If that statement involved the true question before us, presented in the bill of the Foreign Affairs Committee, my regret would lead to silence. The fallacy of measures like this, consists in assuming that everything which seems to be for the welfare and glory of the country is truly so and that every beneficent law in seeming, is authorized by our Constitution.

LOVERS OF THE LABORING-MAN.

The district which I represent is composed almost entirely of artisans and laborers. If this measure were constitutional and helpful to labor nothing would give me more pleasure than to contribute to its relief in the distress which everywhere prevails. But it by no means follows, because this bill is urged in the interest of those who live on the product of labor, that it will assist those who produce.

It is an old sophism to profess to be good in order to do ill. The maxim which attributes many crimes in Liberty's name, is a household truism, with a terrible history. When Napoleon III distributed the prizes at the great French exhibition in 1867 how eloquently he spoke of his lively solicitude for the interests of the workingman. Not long after that he crucified France. When a protectionist member was laboring here in 1870 for a high bounty for his own patented Bessemer steel he closed his touching appeal, not for himself, O, no ! but for the workingman ! In vain do we wait for any movement here to relieve labor at home, to secure its just reward and elevate its condition. In vain do we look for any movement to harmonize it with capital that prosperity to both may come ! Such measures as this are not moved by the masses. They come from the gilded apex, not the broad base of the common weal. No doubt this exhibition will be, as others have been, gorgeous in display. Aurelian fettered his captive Zenobia with gold and the slave held up the golden fetter. He loaded the object to adorn his triumph, as we cumber our labor by such taxes as these that we may shine afar !

No doubt the gentlemen who are foremost in asking these contributions for the display of their products are men entirely disinterested and patriotic. If their hands are not, the hands which work for them are callous with toil. Indeed, a showing of hands in this Congress would be an instructive illustration of the enormous working ability of its members in earning an honest livelihood !

THE USE OF STIMULANTS.

This bill has been justified as similar bills have been justified, and especially the Centennial bill, on the ground that the country is in the condition of a man who has just turned the crisis of a violent fever, exhausted by long sickness and low diet. It was urged in that centennial debate (Record, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, page 484) "that the system must be built up anew, and it must begin with stimulants." The necessity of stimulants to build up an exhausted constitution, whether it be Federal or personal, might well be referred to a sanitary commission consisting of doctors learned in the law and in medicine. They would find that stimulants are dangerous remedies.

OBJECTS OF THE MEASURE.

Before, however, discussing the authority to levy large taxes as a stimulus, would it not be well to examine, first, what is the kind of stimulation and who are its subjects and ministers.

The bill as originally propounded by the President in his message and by the Secretary of State seems to intend something more than the benefit of American industries. This bill proposes to stimulate their sinking condition and contribute to their advancement at home and abroad. It might truly be entitled "An act to levy taxes to allow our gentry to visit Paris, advertise goods, and erect a corn-kitchen." [Laughter.]

THE FIRST PROGRAMME.

The bill as originally contributed by the Secretary of State proposed to pay out of our Treasury \$225,000 to defray expenses of commissioners, experts, scientists, artisans, civil agencies, traveling agents, and transportations across the country and ocean, as well as landing, protecting, and reshipping of goods. To this were added expenses of reporters and reports, some \$12,000; and after exhausting all possible methods of extracting money from the Treasury for this purpose so foreign to our shores and our Constitution, a needless appropriation of \$13,000 for "contingencies" was thrust in to round the whole sum of \$225,000.

Our committee were not disposed to accept all these extravagant and indefinite items. They have introduced a bill of their own, only a little less extravagant and in almost every regard as thoroughly indefensible. The majority report asks for \$150,000 for the purposes indicated by the Secretary of State; and, sad to say, they struck out, against my vote, the Indian corn proposition of my intelligent and honorable colleague, [Mr. HEWITT.] I have endeavored, by an amendment and a smaller sum, to rescue the agricultural interest from this neglect of the committee.

WHAT THE MINORITY PROPOSE.

The minority of the committee, which reported this bill, while not agreeing to its constitutionality, see no objection to furnishing Government vessels for transportation to and from France, free of charge, of articles for exhibition; nor do they undertake to say that any discourtesy should be allowed in not fully recognizing the invitation of France; but, in carrying out the provisions of the joint resolution, they prefer that no tax should be levied for so doubtful a purpose. If other gentlemen, however, can find it to be constitutional to vote appropriations for these objects, I offer an amendment for funds adequate to secure official recognition, to be placed with the Secretary of State, and another and separate fund for the Commissioner of Agriculture, to be used at his discretion. More than that would be wasteful excess.

A SHOP AND SHOW AND A SACRIFICE.

I proceed to the consideration of the objects—the real and not the simulated objects of the bill. This exposition of Paris, like others, including our Centennial, savors of the shop and displays like a show. There is not a particle of patriotism in it; indeed the old word patriotism has almost lost its meaning. We have many persons ready to *live* for and on their country, but it is hard to find within the broad domain of this heaven-blessed land one who would *die* for it. To extract money deftly from the Treasury, in our new lexicon, that is patriotism.

There was a young lady in a New England town to whom a fortune was bequeathed. She had a missionary spirit, and called the deacons of her church around her to know where she ought to go to bestow her grace and means in saving sinners. The good deacons spoke of Timbuctoo and India; but said she, "Is not Paris, too, a very bad place?" They said it was: full of fashion, frivolity, and wickedness. She said she thought she would try Paris first. The promoters of this bill are equally good. They would save Paris from its sins by sewing-machines, pianos, sulky-plows, and Indian corn. They would sacrifice much of time and labor to reclaim the ignorant and bad; only they want our poor people to pay for the pious pilgrimage by an appropriation.

THE FLAG AND AN APPROPRIATION.

I was in hopes that the persiflage which is always called in to glorify such appropriations had evaporated with the centennial year and exhibition. Do we not recall how members apostrophized George Washington, pictured on one side of you, Mr. Speaker, and La Fayette on the other?

We have had the same sublimity of speech on this measure; but one tires of a perpetual diet so highly seasoned. This kind of rhetoric, Mr. Speaker, would be interesting and harmless if it did not tend to empty the Treasury and add fresh burdens to an already overburdened people.

FOREIGN RHETORIC ON SIMILAR THEMES.

Such grandiose expressions have not infrequently been used in other countries to fill the swelling exchequers of selfish and mercenary men. Even the English exhibitions of 1851 and 1862, which had no appropriation, were heralded by a chorus of superb harmonies whose powerful tones seemed to ring out in stupendous unison like the sixty-five hundred voices which I heard in the Crystal Palace of that year:

All people that on earth do dwell,
Sing to the Lord with cheerful voice;

while "amens" and "hallelujahs" were to usher in the reign of "peace and good will to men." Conquest and carnage were to be abjured forever. Alas! for the bloody sequel.

The main business of that exhibition, so far as America was concerned, was limited to our frightful edifice of india-rubber, which typified the elasticity of our national conscience and development; to our thousands of daguerreotypes to show the remarkable men and vanity of our country, to two of our Iowa Indians, who stood in profound sorrow, betraying their nostalgia, trophies of our conquering and implacable civilization, and to the beautiful Greek Slave, the occasion of satire and irony upon our institutions!

MANUFACTURE OF MILLENNIUMS.

The Paris exhibition of 1862 was also heralded as a harbinger of

peace among the nations. It was the symbol of the federation of the world. Then arose, as soon again will arise, upon the banks of the Seine a dazzling edifice, with its imperial commission and splendors. Some called it a great sham, an iniquitous job, and a crying scandal ; but rhetoricians in France, with picturesque verbiage, transformed it into a universal congress of art and industry, a giant tournament of thinkers and workers, and, as a climax, an infallible guarantee of the brotherhood of nations. Yet that Emperor who patronized that exhibition of peace and good will, and who, like another Augustus, had transformed an old metropolis of filth, lawlessness, and vanity into a seat of splendor, ædility, and luxury, fell with France at Sedan, and the reign of Mars was postponed only by exhaustion and insensate fury. That French exhibition, like that portion of Vienna which some fondly called "our own," was described as one of "jobbers, higglers, and hagglers, incredibly avid of riches, unblushingly extortionate in trade, ceaselessly hungering after francs and centimes." It was not in the power of the third Napoleon, nor that of the shows and shops that belonged to his era of brass and gold, to manufacture a millenium.

THE FIELD OF MARS.

The Champ de Mars had many memories of war and revolution. It was upon this field that Robespierre erected an altar to the Supreme Being. Surrounded by his chiefs, he celebrated the *fête* by dedicating flowers, fruits, and ears of corn, while all swore to defend the republic. It was then and there that the grand hymn to God was sung, while the sanguinary hypocrites offered our innocent maize to propitiate the Eternal. It was accounted a grand thing to open upon its plaza an exhibition of arts and mechanism, where oriental magnificence in fabrics contested the palm with the severer grandeurs of western skill. To the sybarite and the mechanic, to the chemist and soldier, to artisan and tradesman, to sultan and subject gathered upon this historic ground, there seemed for a time to dawn a roseate era of universal interchange. Upon that field of Mars, which centuries before had been the gathering place of warriors, was to be realized more than the dreams of Utopia. It was to be a mart of industry typical of pruning-hooks and plowshares. How long after that, before the German Uhlans encamped within the walls of the fated city?

The wars which have since followed show that in giving the "Legion of honor" to the Yankee piano-forte with a fiddle attachment, or a gold medal for a carved Belgian cupboard, the lion was not induced to lie down with the lamb, except he had swallowed the lamb. The meanness and rapacity of its promoters were only excelled by the disgraceful exhibition which our own nation made subsequently at Vienna.

SHODDY, GOOD AND BAD.

It was the display of shoddy in its worse sense. I would rescue shoddy from its sinister meaning. Shoddy has become a term of reproach, but if you stop its supply the price of wool would double. Millions of people would then miss their warm winter clothes. If, however, shoddy is not mixed with new wool, it becomes not only a disgrace to trade, but a just nickname for mercenary roguery. If our exhibition at Paris should degenerate into the unmixed shoddy, as at Vienna, better not to have exhibited our weakness at all.

EXHIBITION THIRST.

The most that the Paris exhibition did for America was the introduction of American drinks. There was a perpetual disease in and

around it called the "Exhibition thirst," which was well described by George Augustus Sala as "leading to wandering in spirits and in mind." If you asked any question of the stranger about Paris, he dilated upon the "noggs," "cobblers," "smashers," "cocktails," "eye-openers," "moustache-twisters," and "corpse-revivers" of the American restaurant. [Laughter.] Stewed oysters, terrapins, soft-shell crabs, canvas-back ducks, and prairie hens were introduced under the Stars and Stripes, to the attention, admiration, amazement, and stomachs of the French population for the first time. Nor are the provisions of the original bill for a corn diet any novelty in France, for green corn and succotash were as common then as cobblers and cocktails. [Laughter.]

GENERAL-WELFARE CLAUSE.

Under some clause of our Constitution for the general welfare and happiness of mankind our appropriation for this exhibition is justified. Such exhibitions not only fail to give dignity and grandeur to our character as a nation, but utterly fail to contribute to the common defense and general welfare. They fail to usher in that intelligence, courage, and unassuming glory which should illustrate the first republic of the world.

STRICT CONSTRUCTION AND RESERVED POWER.

Seriously, Mr. Chairman, it is about time that the pendulum swung from one extreme to the other in relation to constitutional construction and taxation. It is true that parties seem to be changing on vital rules of construction. What has not the last year brought forth? Let me use a fable to teach the lesson. It is said that there was a giant once who swallowed windmills without choking, but who was suffocated next day by a piece of fresh butter! [Laughter.] So with our republican State-rights friends. There was nothing too huge or crooked which they did not swallow under the war power and for twelve years after the war; but when the votes of States falsely personated came to us in a Federal way their hatred of State rights vanished. They swallowed State rights as if they had the lubricity of butter. The recent elections look as if they suffered, if they were not suffocated, by the act of deglutition.

It is well, when our opponents here are carrying reserved rights to such extremes, for us to consider how far we are swinging in the other direction. If this measure is to be justified in a democratic House, where is the limit for any and all objects which hover like birds of prey about the Treasury?

Whatever good may be done our industries by such expositions, there are many distinguished in public life who are not ready to admit that there is any authority to tax for any such purpose. When we ask those who favor such schemes for any grant of power to sanction such appropriations, they spread into platitudes. In the Centennial debate one member justified the appropriation by saying that we had a right to show other nations that we exist, and, therefore, an appropriation was justifiable. (Record, Forty-first Congress, first session, page 522.) As Mr. Townsend, of Pennsylvania, remarked:

We have expended more than five billions to render it certain that this nation shall exist. We have spent five billions to *have* a centennial, and when you come to the constitutional question—the question of right—I say, sir, that if a nation has a right to *exist*, it has a right to show to the world that it *does* exist.

Another member argued that, as it only cost three and a half cents apiece to our people, and as it was the boiled-down essence of all the Fourth of Julys for a hundred years, the appropriation was con-

stitutional. Another member argued that, inasmuch as America was almost a *terra incognita* to Europe, by bringing Europe to us, we would enable its people to see our country for themselves; and therefore it was constitutional to appropriate a million and a half of dollars. Another argued that, as the retina of the soul would be painted by panoramas of Bunker Hill and of Yorktown, and of Washington buffeting with the waves of the icy Delaware, it was constitutional. [Laughter.]

Aside from this irrelevant rhetoric I put a question as one belonging to the old school of strict constructionists, from which I have rarely deviated in a long service: *Where* is the power in Congress to grant such an appropriation? Point to a line which justifies it! Standing on the ancient ways, if we have failed before, let us now assert that it is greater to preserve our fundamental law from infraction than to spread over all the continents every division of our industry, commercial, mechanical, physical, economical, or miscellaneous. As the greater includes the less; as the creator is above the creature, is it not a greater incentive to other nations to behold our Republic preserve its integrity and its Constitution, its genius and polity, its many-in-one, its local distinct from its Federal power over affairs, than to display all our wealth or power in mere material success? What are all the arts, whether related to the alimentary, sanitary, domiciliary, locomotive, sensitive, intellectual, or social life, which make up these universal shows, compared with the elemental and undying principles which lift our Republic above the waves of time and the tempests of revolution? Weave what warp and woof you may; delve for the mineral, however rich; construct your titanic machines, however grand, complicated, or refined; calculate your longitudes or discover new moons by mathematics and telescopes; put your girdle around the earth or under the sea, by chemistry; chisel the Greek Slave with Powers; excel Gérôme or Meissonnier or Rosa Bonheur upon the easel; display terracottas more beautiful than those of Harzé, bronzes better than Barbédienne's, or porcelain the peer of Sèvres; tapestry and carpets rivaling the Gobelins or Aubesson; jewelry to outshine Christofle, of Paris, or Castellani, of Rome; make better mosaics than of Salviati, or the enamels better than those of Le Pecq; reproduce here the ceramic and other lost arts which are now reviving throughout Europe; and you will yet find no compensation in these accomplishments, in the mimicry and mummery of the army of honorary nabobs, dandies, and bummers who cluster about a foreign exhibition. Much less, sir, will these achievements condone for any fracture in its smallest part of the greatest refinement of civil polity, which is illustrated in our political faith, order, and Constitution. [Applause.] Not for all the grandeur of mechanical science and skill should we barter this precious principle of construction applied to that instrument by all our best statesmen and courts, namely, that powers not granted by the Constitution cannot be exercised by Congress, and that no powers are granted except what are expressed as such, or are fairly inferable as requisite means to attain the end of a power itself granted.

THE TAXING CLAUSE—ITS MEANING.

Such appropriations as that now under discussion have been sought to be justified by the first clause of the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution:

Congress shall have power to lay and collect taxes, duties, imposts and excises, to pay the debts and provide for the common defense and general welfare of the United States.

If, under this clause, this appropriation can be made, we are on an uncertain and limitless sea; any appropriation, for any purpose, is then possible. If this clause be applicable, it is a lie to say that our Government is one of special and enumerated powers.

Is it said that by the words "general welfare" no appropriation can be made unless it is designed to effect that object? Who is to determine what is the general welfare? Congress, then, at its discretion, may determine what is or is not for the general welfare. There is no limit to the power. You can take money for any purpose. By a like loose construction you may establish schools in Thibet or extract sunbeams from cucumbers. Mr. Chairman, there is but one rule; it is inflexible. You can only provide for the general welfare by exercising the powers that are delegated to you in the Constitution. You cannot go outside of the express delegations of power, and roam at will, to find something that might promote that welfare.

PRECEDENTS.

It will not do to say that precedents have been made. Almost every provision of the Constitution has been downtrodden by bad administration or legislation. It is the crying sin of our time that that our lands and moneys have been squandered that scoundrels and bankrupts might live in luxury. And even for a good purpose I should never sanction an erroneous construction of the Constitution, lest a precedent should creep in upon the State, for its dishonor and ruin.

The gentleman from Virginia, [Mr. TUCKER,] who is both a lawyer and a publicist, in the Centennial discussion divided this power to lay and collect taxes, &c., into three branches, (Record, Forty-fourth Congress, first session, page 510:) First, as to laying and collecting; second, as to paying debts and providing for the common defense and general welfare; and, third, a qualification on the power in the first branch of the sentence.

To suppose—

Said he—

that the learned men of the convention had injected as a substantial power the words in the second branch of the sentence, and then in the third branch qualified the first branch, would be to attribute to them a miserable lack of knowledge of the rules of grammar and of style. Hence the usual and generally conceded construction of the two clauses has been that it attached to the first clause as a definition of the purposes of the tax power, limiting its use only to such objects; and that the second clause cannot be clearly held to contain a new and substantial grant of power.

Who ever believed that this power to levy and collect taxes, &c., interpreted as it has been by Mr. Madison in the forty-first number of *The Federalist*, amounted to an unlimited commission to exercise every power which may be alleged to be necessary for the common defense or general welfare? "No stronger proof," said he, "can be given of the distress under which these writers labor for objections than their stooping to such a misconstruction." Error," he said, "would always receive its own condemnation."

THE RULE APPLIED TO EXHIBITIONS PAST.

Then let me inquire whether a bill of this kind comes within such a construction as I have indicated. Surely there has existed much doubt as to our authority to vote money for these shows. Austria invited us to Vienna, first on the 12th of July, 1870, and, finding us reluctant, again on the 22d of September, 1871. Congress took no action until June 10, 1872, and then authorized the President to ap-

point our agents; but provided: "That such appointments shall not impose on this Government any liability for the expense which they may occasion." This was all, until February 14, 1873, when \$200,000 were passed through Congress. Of this nearly all was spent; how, will appear hereafter. But our first cautious action is to be noted. We had not then entered so largely on speculations by act of Congress.

Again: In the case of the Centennial appropriation, at its inception, in 1872, its promoters were so doubtful of the power of appropriation that they simply asked for and obtained an act of Congress creating a commission to prepare plans and buildings but providing that the United States should not be liable for any expense attending such exhibition or by reason of the same. If this was the cautious action at first as to the Centennial, what can we say of the audacity of those who would unconstitutionally create a mercenary expedition to Paris, to exhibit their goods, wares and merchandise, for their own greed and gain? Who contends seriously that for the purpose of transporting samples and advertising them in Paris, an army of officers, such as this measure proposes, was ever contemplated by the men who framed our organic law? If the fathers of the Republic were jealous of entangling alliances abroad, and made our country respected and great through independence of Europe, where is the authority to impress upon the effete dynasties of the Old World or their republican copyists in France, our toys, and drinks, and boot-jacks, and turnips, and all the variety of our mineral, agricultural, and manufacturing products? Were not these matters to be left to economic laws? Where is the clause of the Constitution to levy and collect taxes, that our rich manufacturers may display their gin and buttons, their gutta-percha and glue, their iron machines and agricultural implements before the world?

FOREIGNERS COPY OUR INVENTIONS.

First. If such appropriations were constitutional how would it aid our artisans or manufacturers by showing foreigners how to copy our inventions, improve upon our skill, or only to make an outlet and market for our products, which must of course be temporary, if it is intended to teach other nations our tricks of trade and our genius for improvement? There are many manufacturers who understand what is meant by this comment on our display. It helps a temporary market only to ruin it permanently.

APPROPRIATIONS NOT NECESSARY TO TRADE.

Second. Suppose that such exhibitions do enlarge our markets, as contended for by the eloquent member from Wisconsin, [Mr. WILLIAMS,] and constitute an incentive to other nations to improve upon their machinery and production, cannot the same object be accomplished without a violation of the Constitution or without an appropriation by Congress? Does it require a torture of the one or an act of the other to inspire the maker of soft textures of wool, or fine linen, or glossy silk? Do we need the stimulus of an exposition to bring our meat-stuffs, bread-stuffs, eggs, butter, cattle, horses, and mules into a foreign market? Did the centennial make our grain crops? Already we are growing in our export trade by the hundred millions, through refrigerators and steam, quick transit, and smart agencies. Appropriations did not inspire Jacquard's dream, out of which came his wonderful loom. Did the Corliss engine, mighty as a Titan to rend the oak, result from the Centennial or antedate it? Was it a Government appropriation which gave Whitney's cotton-gin to the South, with its three hundred millions saved per annum?

Did the exhibition of 1851 cause McCormick's reaper or only show it off? Suppose that the exhibition should incite to the discovery of new elements of industry for the amelioration of mankind, does it follow that a Government appropriation is necessary for that purpose? Did Congress start the sewing-machine, or the Gatling gun, or the steamship, or Bessemer steel? If the truth were told, these matters came in spite of Congress. We have American hardware stores in Germany, and our cottons now go to South America, but it is in spite of Federal law. Does Steinway or Weber want an act of Congress to send their pianos to a market, or Wheeler & Wilson their sewing-machines to Japan, or Herring his safes to Europe? They are there already. Point to a single page of the statutes where a dollar has been authorized to be expended, except indirectly, by tariffs except to hurt and not to help traffic and labor.

Was it because Franklin was a member of the constitutional convention that he discovered new uses for the electric phenomena which then attracted the attention of the scientific world, or was it because he was a volunteer without aid, enlisting in the army of science? He was a simple member of a literary society in Philadelphia. Having his attention called to a recent discovery, the phenomena of the Leyden jar, from that moment he put the question, *cui bono*? He wrote to the Royal Society of London his first disappointment in failing to find any practical application of the science:

Chagrined a little—

He wrote—

that we have hitherto been able to produce nothing in the way of use to mankind, and the hot weather coming on, when electrical experiments are not so agreeable, it is proposed to put an end to them for the season, somewhat humorously, in a party of pleasure, on the banks of the Schuylkill. Spirits, at the same time, are to be fired by a spark sent from side to side through the river, without any other conductor than the water, an experiment which we some time since performed to the amazement of many. A turkey is to be killed for dinner by the electrical shock, and roasted by the electrical jack before a fire kindled by the electrical bottle—

Since known as the Leyden phial—

when the health of all the famous electricians in England, Holland, France, and Germany are to be drank in electrified bumpers, under the discharge of guns from the electrical battery.

True, afterward he invented lightning-rods, with pointed conductors, to save houses and ships and what not; but at first so averse were the laughing philosophers of the Royal Society to Franklin's "points" that they actually caused *blunt* conductors to be placed upon the British palace! But did Franklin ask for an appropriation?

Was the safety-lamp, or the locomotive, or the wonderful art and mechanism displayed in printing-machines and calico-printing, in hydraulic machinery, the construction of bridges, Whitworth's micrometer, turning, planing, boring and cutting machines, or his wondrous lathe, the result of English or French exhibitions? True, they were exhibited there, and their exhibition may have been the cause of other and better inventions; but I deny that the English exhibition of 1851 became instrumental through Government aid for such purposes.

THE EXHIBITION OF 1851—NO APPROPRIATION.

There was not a shilling appropriated by Great Britain for that exhibition or its London and Dublin successors, although Parliament is not restrained as we are by any question of constitutional want of power. The success of that exhibition was due to the action of the liberal-minded Prince Albert, who offered himself to the public as

their leader. It was long discussed whether it should be limited to British industry; for there was an isolation about the British mind then, that led to a prejudice against foreign productions of machinery, science, and taste. It was doubted then by many, as it has been doubted much in this country, by a class of economists, whether such productions, which are of no country but belong to the world, would be of particular advantage to British industry by being placed in competition.

The great exhibition of 1851 was the beginning of a new era of British prosperity, because it opened a thousand shut avenues of trade. Paxton's fairy palace, itself a greater wonder than of all within it, was exhibited by England as a spectacle of the world's progress and as a token of future English supremacy,

When its blazing arch of glass
Leaped like a fountain from the grass
To meet the sun.

When its rare pavilion had been built and glassed, and sung by poets and blessed by archbishops, was there any dedication by government? As M. Chevalier writes, (Dr. Lardner's Great Exhibition, page 479:)

It was projected, organized, and completed, from first to last, without governmental interference. The arrangements were made, the plans prepared, the work executed, without the authorities claiming the initiation or desiring to take the patronage of the enterprise. For such an exhibition there would have been in France twenty times more ministerial ordinances issued, official circulars signed and published, a hundred times more scraps of paper blotted in the bureau of the French ministry of commerce than in that of the Board of Trade of London.

OVERLEGISLATION.

Doubtless Prince Albert took the largest share in the arrangements, but it was in his individual capacity. It was personal influence alone, more considerable than his rank, that he brought to bear. Private meetings began as early as 1849. Communications were sent to industrial establishments, but no law ordinance, no order of council, was ever issued. Moneys were raised, medals and rewards were provided for, capitalists, manufacturers, and public-spirited men organized and consummated the exhibition. The only interference of government was the semblance of an official nomination by the Queen of the royal commission. In our amendment to this bill, the minority contemplate similar recognition. At one time the English government was solicited to take a great share of the direction of the enterprise of 1851, on the ground that it was indispensable to success; but, wisely appreciating the part it should take, it declined the offer, "which," says M. Chevalier, "in any other country would have been an irresistible temptation." The collective force which made that exhibition the wonder of the world came out of the liberty of private enterprise. It was an illustration of fitness to govern by self-abnegation of power.

This interference by Government with such mere material interests is a pregnant example of bad government, or what Herbert Spencer calls "overlegislation." It received a stab from the lips of Governor Tilden on his return from Europe, in general denunciation of Federal interference in extraneous and private objects. As in France the government takes charge of the smallest details, from the running of a bath to the raising of horses; as in Spain or in Turkey the government either manufactures cigars or farms out its revenues, thus illustrating the pernicious principle of monopoly, oppression, and intervention, so in our country in these latter days we are beginning to copy these pernicious patterns of paternal government.

FAIRS ARE NOT A NEW THING.

The Exhibition of 1851 was the first of the international kind. Before that time the various nations of Europe and of Asia had their fairs and shows. They date from the earliest eras. The Greeks and Romans had them. The German term "massen," from mass, meant a fair. In France they are thirteen hundred years old. Alfred the Great, brought them to Great Britain. Hundreds of thousands have attended the French fairs. Mecca has had them, and the Ganges has seen its thousands of trades thus gathered. I have seen them in remote parts of Northern Africa, where men—nomads of the plain, and traders of the city—come together to buy and sell, barter and learn. The greatest of all these is in Asia, on the borders of China, at Nizhni Novgorod, where thousands semi-yearly congregate. But 1851 gave a new impetus to these undertakings, running not through days and weeks but whole seasons. Since 1851, there have been not less than twenty universal exhibitions, including our own Centennial, besides the great fairs of London, Paris, and Vienna. Munich, Florence, New York, Amsterdam, Dublin, Cork, Cologne, Lyons, Oporto, Stettin, and even New Zealand and Japan, have had their grand symposia of industry. If we are to begin appropriations for such universal objects, where are we to draw the line and where end?

THE ENGLISH EXHIBITIONS WITHOUT APPROPRIATIONS.

I remember well, when twenty-five years younger, visiting that more than Aladdin palace in Hyde Park. That mighty building yet rises among my earliest and most attractive reminiscences. Day after day I wandered along its aisles, wondering at the mystery of the maker and the genius of the inventor, astounded at the power which combined the atoms of earth, water, and air, and harnessed the forces of nature, as the outward symbol of the everlasting brain of aggressive man. But it had no appropriation! What Professor Sewell wrote of the divine Plato, likening his ethics to a splendid Gothic monster, I felt, as I wandered into these mazes, far sinking into splendors: "We may stand among his venerable works as in a vast and consecrated fabric. Vistas and aisles of thought opening on every side; high thoughts, that raise the mind to heaven; pillars and niches and cells within cells, mixing in seeming confusion, and a veil of tracery and foliage and grotesque imagery thrown over all, but all rich with a light streaming through dim religious forms; all leading up to God; all blest with an effluence from Him, though an effluence dimmed and half lost in the contaminated reason of man." Yet, Mr. Chairman, there was no appropriation for that grand exhibition! What manifestations of beauty and of art from all lands rise upon my vision as I recall that palace of industry! Ancient and modern times alike contributed to adorn and glorify this palace, and yet there was no appropriation. From China to Peru, from the mines of Norway and of Mexico, from the fabricators of India, from the gorgeous east, with its barbaric purple and gold interwoven in its textures, to the rude hut and spear of the American Indians and African Caffirs, there was one grand picture of human industry, to illustrate the maxim of the son of Sirach, of ancient Jewish time:

The principal things for the whole use of man's life are water, fire, iron, and salt, flour of wheat, honey, milk, and the blood of grape, oil, and clothing.

All for the delectation and utility of our kind. This rare exhibition and forerunner of so many others, not only did not depend upon government largesses for its success but refused them as a means for its consummation. From that time England increased her colonial

and foreign trades. Her exports up to the time of her next great exhibition in 1862 more than doubled. Her colonies emerged out of discontent and difficulty; and while the great streams of her empire were bridged by triumphant mechanism, all parts of her dependencies were imbound in a common British glory. Yet not one shilling from the government aided in this work.

When the great exhibition of 1851 in England was projected, who leaped forward to contribute funds voluntarily? A hundred thousand dollars was at once subscribed, for medals and awards; three hundred thousand then followed for other purposes. Messrs. Munday, great contractors, proposed to undertake the construction of the building at their own risk. Their offer was declined, because they were contractors. One individual, Mr. Peto, who then bore the same relation to England and her railroads that certain men now sustain to ours, subscribed \$250,000; and a banker, Mr. Lloyd, followed; and the financial notabilities who answer to our Coopers, Seligmans, Belmonts, and other rich men gave individual guarantees amounting to \$100,000, upon which the Bank of England offered to make advances. Five thousand people registered themselves as promoters; nearly ten millions' worth of articles was shown; six million people visited it, and a balance of £213,305 15s. 8d., or nearly \$1,000,000,000 resulted as net profit. It was not necessary, as it is not now necessary, that government should give bounties to have the concurrence of other governments for such objects.

The exhibition of 1851 succeeded because of the courage of the thought that international rivalry could be accomplished without government aid.

It was repeated in 1862 by private enterprise. The advantages of such enterprise to England between 1851 and 1862 need not be commented on. It encouraged free trade; it repealed the duties on soap and paper, the only manufactures then which had been thwarted by excise restrictions. It increased the facilities by post and abolished taxes on knowledge. It led to the repeal of duties on raw materials. It gave strength to English production in all its branches and yet not a government penny for appropriation! Is it possible that we cannot carry our flag abroad without the suggestion of lucre and the meanness of speculation?

OUR CAPITALISTS BEGGING GOVERNMENT HELP.

/ And yet the capitalists of this country—\$500,000,000 represented—come in the name of our pauper labor and ask additional taxes to be laid upon our workingmen for their own special greed and glory. If these capitalists desire so much to assist the laboring-men and to do it by means which are themselves considered doubtful, why not adopt the bill of the gentleman from Pennsylvania, [Mr. WRIGHT,] to take from the Treasury money enough to send the poor of our cities, packed in tenement-houses and almost destitute of good food, shelter, and clothing, to the rich prairies of the West or the teeming savannas of the South.

OUR SCIENCE AT HOME.

But if gentlemen must spend money to glorify our science and art, let them go to our Observatory and observe its dilapidated condition. Yet what a pride, legitimate and glorious, has it not become? It enables us to determine points within our own land, their latitudes and longitudes, boundaries and stations. Co-operating with the Navy, it determines points abroad. It is the depot where the chronometers for the Navy are kept and rated, and from which naval vessels are

supplied with them on going into commission. It drops a time-ball at noon from its own dome, and, through the agency of the telegraph wires, a ball at noon also in the city of New York, and gives the time to the wires for transmission through the United States. It has rendered essential aid to the American Ephemeris and Nautical Almanac by perfecting the tables indispensable to the navigator and the astronomer. Quotations from foreign scientific reviews could be adduced to prove that the work of the United States Observatory is highly appreciated abroad. The distinguished astronomer of Rome, Padre Secchi, places together in the first class the observatories of Pulkova, Greenwich, and Washington. The search for new objects has never been made a part of the regular work of the Observatory, because it has been felt that an institution supported at the expense of the nation should confine its energies to fields known to be remunerative. Still it has taken a place near the highest as a seat of discovery. The first discovery of a planet made on this side of the Atlantic was by Mr. Ferguson, in 1854, with the old telescope of the Observatory. Recently, the discovery of two satellites of Mars by Professor Hall must, by common consent of astronomers, rank as the greatest telescopic discovery since that of Neptune in 1846.

And this, our home institution, so handsomely glorified, is located so as to kill off its officials by malaria; and is as rickety and unsafe as if it had seen a century of decay. When we talk of arts and science let our benefactions begin at home!

OUR VIENNA DISGRACE.

How unlike was this unsubsidized exhibition compared with our part in that of Vienna. I have endeavored to inform myself as to the material effects of the expositions at Paris and Vienna, of which we have elaborate reports—six volumes of the former and four of the latter. Our Centennial reports, perhaps forty volumes, are not yet out. But I do not rely on the official reports from Vienna. They did not develop the unpleasant facts. I have in my hand a volume with pictorial illustrations, showing the beautiful grounds and the buildings which were erected at Vienna, and the classifications and divisions under which the invitation to our own country was accepted. Our part in that exposition was simply disgraceful. Although \$200,000 were appropriated by Congress for our display at Vienna, decent Americans were ashamed of the untidy manner of it and the grossness of its mismanagement. Our articles on exhibition, with few exceptions, were those that were common to our shops. The American exhibitors bore, unaided, the expense of putting their goods on exhibition. They paid for the care of them while there, as well as for the space occupied. They erected their own stands. There was no bureau for information, no plan for interpreting. Notwithstanding the large appropriation, we borrowed of our British cousins the very carpenters and laborers to do the work. The best exhibitors placed their goods as best they could, assisted by private purses. The decorations furnished by our commission were meager and cheap. With a few hundred dollars the self-constituted exhibitors made the best show. There was no sufficient clerical force to conduct the business, and most of the reports are translations from those of other nations. Annoyance was the rule. Says the author (Mr. Meigs) of the volume before me—

In fact when the exhibitor arrived, his goods not having been sent by Government ships, but at his own expense, he was directed by friends to a private gentleman of Cincinnati, who spoke both German and English, and who, fortunately for the country, assumed to represent a large number of exhibitors. He was

enabled to do what the commission could not do: procure the goods from the custom-house or railways, where they were stored, and whose officers knew not what to do with them.

But, after all our appropriation, what was exhibited, even with its aid? Some sewing-machines, inferior to the European; some cereals and other products; and a pork-packing association of Cincinnati, which ought to have been engaged in the slaughter of the American commissioners instead of the innocent preparation of foreign pork. We had a school exhibition which attracted attention; not superior, however, to those of other countries, because not a fair sample of our own. The exhibition of machinery was better, and not quite so disgraceful. In fact we lost prestige, and seemed rather to be retrograding than advancing in the light of these illustrations. We had shoe-machinery, fire-places, puddlers, shuttle-throwers, tire-setters, of which we had a right to be proud; but everything seemed to depend upon the exhibitor, and nothing was done by the commission from which to derive any benefit from the exhibition. The first chairman of the commission held his place to serve himself; but something was rescued from the universal disgrace by several gentlemen, and among them Mr. Schultz, of New York. They did not need high salaries to do it either. Out of the \$200,000 appropriated, scarcely fifty thousand were made serviceable.

Go with me to Vienna during this interesting season. While the soul-stirring strains of Strauss transport you into a German Valhalla, where Dreher's beer flows more abundantly than the music, our commissioners are jangling like bells out of tune. While the throngs of happy Viennese wander under the glare of lamps in the Volksgarten, or drive in state along the Prater, our American exhibitors are making the air vocal with bickering and jealousy.

NORTH CAROLINA ON EXHIBITION.

The petty wrangling, disputes and confusion incident to this disgraceful exhibition were only relieved by two exceptions, and these *were maps*. The first, a map of North Carolina, with a collection of its products, cotton, rice, tobacco, grain, wine, and silk. The first expression of every American who chanced to see your map, sir, [referring to Mr. DAVIS, of North Carolina,] was, "I never knew before the character and value of that State." [Laughter.] What with dilating upon the special advantages of our Rip Van Winkle State, and his magnificent forests of pine; its "tar, pitch, and turpentine," the author from whom I quote says that map was a beautiful feature, by which the pupil "was not forced, but trapped, into learning its attractive merits."

DU LUTH.

He also calls attention to another map, which he says was most creditable to the people of this country, and of the greatest importance and interest to the whole world. "I speak," says he, "of the Northern Pacific Railroad, which showed a 'very large map of their projected railway from the Pacific Ocean to Du Luth!'" [Laughter.] I look about me for the gentleman from Kentucky, [Mr. KNOTT,] whose name is as immortal as Du Luth. [Laughter.] The map was of a very fine order, with beautiful marginal photographic illustrations. It showed the topography, the profile of its elevations, its woods, &c. It was accompanied with statistical information, coupled with cereals and products of the country." Our author does not say that the speech of Hon. J. PROCTOR KNOTT accompanied this map as its commentary; but \$200,000, Mr. Speaker, is a small sum compared with the inestimable utility of such speeches in unmasking the shams and sins of our speculative and subsidized fellow-countrymen. [Laughter.]

It is unnecessary to recall the agricultural products and noble purposes of the owners of Du Luth to show the House how we were represented abroad. A few citations from my friend's remarks will add to the gravity of the subject. When the gentleman from Kentucky [Mr. KNOTT] was aroused to the importance of Du Luth and had rushed to the library, panting as the hart for the water-brook, he found—what? [Laughter.] One of the Du Luth maps, the very map at Vienna. [Laughter.] He first found the position of Du Luth. I quote:

Sir, had it not been for this map, kindly furnished me by the Legislature of Minnesota, I might have gone down to my obscure and humble grave in an agony of despair, because I could nowhere find Du Luth. [Renewed laughter.] Had such been my melancholy fate, I have no doubt that with the last feeble pulsation of my breaking heart, with the last faint exhalation of my fleeting breath, I should have whispered, "Where is Du Luth?" [Roars of laughter.]

But, thanks to the beneficence of that band of ministering angels who have their bright abodes in the far-off capital of Minnesota, just as the agony of my anxiety was about to culminate in the frenzy of despair, this blessed map was placed in my hands; and as I unfolded it a resplendent scene of ineffable glory opened before me, such as I imagine burst upon the enraptured vision of the wandering peri through the opening gates of paradise. [Renewed laughter.] There, there for the first time, my enchanted eye rested upon the ravishing word "Du Luth."

* * * * *
If gentlemen will examine it they will find Du Luth not only in the center of the map, but represented in the center of a series of concentric circles one hundred miles apart, and some of them as much as four thousand miles in diameter, embracing alike in their tremendous sweep the fragrant savannas of the sunlit South, and the eternal solitudes of snow that mantle the ice-bound North. [Laughter.] How these circles were produced is perhaps one of those primordial mysteries that the most skillful paleologist will never be able to explain. [Renewed laughter.] But the fact is, sir, Du Luth is pre-eminently a central place, for I am told by gentlemen who have been so reckless of their own personal safety as to venture away into those awful regions where Du Luth is supposed to be that it is so exactly in the center of the visible universe that the sky comes down at precisely the same distance all around it. [Roars of laughter.]

I find by reference to this map that Du Luth is situated somewhere near the western end of Lake Superior, but as there is no dot or other mark indicating its exact location I am unable to say whether it is actually confined to any particular spot, or whether "it is just lying around there loose." [Renewed laughter.] I really cannot tell whether it is one of those ethereal creations of intellectual frost-work, more intangible than the rose-tinted clouds of a summer sunset; one of those airy exhalations of the speculator's brain, which I am told are ever flitting in the form of towns and cities along those lines of railroad built with Government subsidies, luring the unwary settler as the mirage of the desert lures the famishing traveler on and ever on, until it fades away in the darkening horizon, or whether it is a real, *bona fide*, substantial city, all "staked off," with the lots marked with their owners's names, like that proud commercial metropolis recently discovered on the desirable shores of San Domingo. [Laughter.] But, however that may be, I am satisfied Du Luth is there, or thereabout, for I see it stated here on this map that it is exactly thirty-nine hundred and ninety miles from Liverpool. [Laughter.] Though I have no doubt, for the sake of convenience, it will be moved back ten miles, so as to make the distance an even four thousand. [Renewed laughter.]

It is injustice to my friend to quote further unless I insert the whole speech as a commentary on subsidizing private speculations. The productions of that climate, its sandy soil, its Piegan Indians and buffalo bulls—[laughter]—but, sir, I refrain, only remarking that this exhibition of Du Luth was the crowning glory of the American exhibition at Vienna. It teaches a lesson also as to other exhibitions.

This Vienna exhibition seemed to be utterly irresponsible. Fifty thousand dollars was to be expended for salaries and expenditures of all persons receiving places authorized by the resolution, and as the artisans and scientific reporters were the only persons authorized to be appointed by the resolution, it is clear that the money was wastefully used and has never been satisfactorily accounted for, which is another warning to us as to a bill of this nature

THE FIVE-HUNDRED-MILLION-DOLLAR PETITION.

A petition has been presented in favor of this measure, and the statement was widely disseminated by telegraph that it represented five hundred millions of capital in New York City alone. If these capitalists, mostly bankers, are so anxious for the exposition of their goods why do they not themselves pay the expenses? Is this Congress to be forever at the call of capital? Have not the syndicate, the subsidists, the tariff beneficiaries, and the bounty-fed mail lines had enough to do with this Congress, to its scandal? When those who have been made rich by tariffs and who have foisted their fallacies upon the Government through foreign exhibitions shall come forward to aid the workingmen in some practical way without drawing from the Treasury, I could then understand the reason why strikes should cease and armies be limited.

CORN AND ITS KITCHEN.

But to hide the little devices incorporated in this bill, to hoodwink the farming interests, and to serve the rich men and manufacturers, who will manage for their own interests under it, an amendment will be offered providing that we shall have an American kitchen to cook Indian corn in various ways. In that kitchen are to be taught all the arts of making and cooking the multifarious preparations of Indian corn. It is to be sold as near cost as possible, and to be distributed gratuitously in "receipts" for cooking, in the various tongues represented at the exhibition. [Laughter.] A man is to be selected to stand in the kitchen and explain the best methods of preparing and cooking. We are to have interpreters in all the tongues at Paris, Chinese, Japanese, Otaheitan, Berber, Turkish, Persian, Greek, Italian, Choctaw, &c.—all. It will not only be pentecostal, but costly. A heathen Chinese approaches my friend from New York, [Mr. HEWITT,] for of course he will be a commissioner—I think my friend from Indiana [Mr. HAMILTON] called him a "grand high commissionnaire of hominy." He asks, "Amelikee man, give me co'nee on the ear." [Laughter.] He gives it; hot, stale corn. Does he enjoy it? See when he returns: "Amelikee man give me univelsal cholikee—hellee!" [Great laughter.] But, sir, the alimentary question is too great for present discussion. [Laughter.]

This proposition for a kitchen and corn, with its interpretation, presupposes, first, that we are the only country that raises this cereal and that no other country has any knowledge of it; and second, that it will open a large market for our corn abroad. As to the first, I need not say what I mentioned to my colleague when he was present before our committee, that the armies at present on the Danube and in Armenia are in part living upon maize of their own raising.

CORN ALREADY RAISED ABROAD.

One would infer from the statements made, that no Indian corn was produced in Europe. I have no statistics of recent production, but in Ruggles's report from the Paris exposition of 1867 he aggregates the total European production at 288,782,340 bushels per annum. In 1860 we had about twice that number. If the same ratio prevails, Europe makes about seven or eight hundred millions. And we are told that we should introduce our samples to induce Europe to accept maize into their households! France alone must produce over seventy-five millions, but of that I cannot speak. Her product in 1867 was about thirty millions, and she has likely preserved her increase with the rest. But as we produce more than twice as much *per capita* of grain of all kinds there is a need, in the interest of human food and its consump-

tion, of removing needless obstacles which would render any great famine impossible. Free trade in corn has become an axiom of economy and a right of humanity. How best our corn market can be enlarged will be considered before I conclude. I have provided for that in my amendment of \$50,000 to be expended by the Department of Agriculture.

MAIZE WELL KNOWN ABROAD.

Maize has always been known in France. It is as well known as the *pâte de foie gras*. That dainty is the monopoly of diplomatic dinners. It even spread to America without an exposition. It invaded, according to a volume I have before me, the town of my friend who sits by me, (Mr. WRIGHT, of Pennsylvania.)

Mr. WRIGHT. O, no. It never came to my district.

Mr. COX, of New York. It was a coal district, in Pottsville, Pennsylvania, and it invaded it with a general indigestion. [Laughter.] How is it made? Sanderson, in his "American in Paris," page 129, tells us:

The goose is now inclosed immovably in a box, where it is crammed with maize and poppy-oil and other succulent food, and its eyes put out so that it may give the whole of its powers to digestion—as that old Greek philosopher, who put out his eyes to give the whole mind to reflection—and a dropsical repletion of the liver being produced by the atony of the absorbents, the liver (the only part of a goose that is now of any account in Europe,) is ready for the market.

Maize for such a purpose becomes not only indispensable, but diplomatic, constitutional, and patriotic. [Laughter.]

Maize was well known to Europe, as early as when Joel Barlow executed his "Hasty-Pudding." The lively, entertaining, and homely gaiety of that poem is in agreeable contrast with the gravity and stateliness of the author's general style and the reports that come to us from the Paris exposition of 1867. Barlow had traveled abroad. He had worshiped the tawny Ceres in other lands; his heart had expanded to meet it in Savoy, where his poem was written. He did not find it in Paris, where shameless Bacchus reveled, nor in London, lost in smoke and steeped in tea; but he "recognized its yellow face, that strong complexion of true Indian race," at the foot of the Alps. He had found it in the Levant under the *alias* of *polanta*; he found it in France as *polante*; as *mush* in Pennsylvania; *suppawn* in New York, the *hasty-pudding* of the Yankee; under one or another name he found it wherever he roamed. It was not always cooked as succotash, nor blended with beans, nor made into hoe-cake; but wherever the sun shone there grew the maize. So that if this great product, estimated at a billion and a half bushels, and which is so cheap in the West that they burn it for fuel, is to undergo the cost of transportation to the seaboard, which is the price of its production, and then go abroad, three thousand miles beyond the starving denizens of our great cities, is already familiar to the European and Asiatic world, it seems like "carrying coals to Newcastle" or bonnets to Paris, to transport it to France in order to show the pupils of Messieurs Soyer, Blot, and Savarin how to cook it. [Laughter.]

STATESMANSHIP CORNED.

Much of my speech upon this topic has been anticipated by the newspaper comments called forth by the interesting conversations of Governor Tilden and the zealous co-operation of my colleague, [Mr. HEWITT.] Full of love for the laboring-man and the great corn-growing West and South, they have returned to their native land with their hands horny with toil in this foreign corn-field. [Laughter.] Our New York avenues are to be razed from their foundations, and those

seats of luxury are to give place to that plant whose green spire declares the sprouting root when the tender germ begins to shoot! Sir, not only will the sweat stream from every cook among the effete kitchens of Europe, but the stalwart sons of toil in our luxurious cities will bead their brows with labor that their simple meals shall be succotash, hoe-cakes, and mush.

INFAMOUS JOURNALISM.

One of our journalists in New York basely charges that the crafty Tilden knew, that my humanitarian colleague [Mr. HEWITT] knew, that this measure would be introduced into Congress, and predicted an increase in the consumption of our corn of over the sixty million bushels which it reached last year. [Laughter.] These prophecies are inspired by the same genius that discerned in the Centennial a mode of paying our public debt and reviving our paralyzed industries. Another journalist charges further that my colleague wished to avenge himself on pauperized Europe by introducing corn as a regular article of diet. [Great laughter.] It is also hinted that some of our distinguished statesmen will be called upon to minister to the long line of *flâneurs* and *petits-mâtres* along the boulevards, while they illustrate how the smoking cob can be gnawed and the dulcet sound of "hot corn" lull them at night into sweet dreams of home. [Laughter.] He then goes so far as to hint that the "pop-corn" fiend will be introduced upon the railways of France. [Laughter.]

INVASION OF GAUL.

But, Mr. Chairman, have we no cherished associations with France, growing out of our revolutionary era, which forbid us to exhibit toward that friendly nation such a spirit of revenge and lack of comity? I have faith in the stern, repressive power of the French government, under its present military president, aided by the advice of the American Cæsar, General Grant, against such unwarrantable irruptions into Gaul. It is many years since that an Indiana minister to Berlin labored to qualify the European stomach for this American diet. His experiment was tried upon Humboldt. It failed; failed, sir, upon griddle-cakes for breakfast, as the *pièce de résistance*. [Laughter.] It failed, even though the Indiana matron compounded it with her own skillful hands. It failed, sir, although the sweet treacle, tinct with the maple of Vermont, with its dulcet sirup, titillated the palate and enthused the fancy. [Laughter.] Why, sir, since this scheme, which contemplated both hog and hominy, both patriotism and grits, both corn-dodgers and corn-juice, failed, even though an American minister, racy of the western soil, had earnestly endeavored to accomplish it, what can be expected from a body of political Jeremy Diddlers and self-sufficient commissioners who know not a full ear from a nubbin! [Laughter.]

LET US SHOW THE GROWING CORN.

The amendment under consideration only proposes to prepare and cook the maize in the presence of the assembled French. This requires an explanation. Why not show how it is grown, how the hills are planted and hoed, the shooting of the tender but not dangerous germ; then the way to protect with ashes from the grub-worm and frighten off birds with the scarecrow, one of the most interesting images of western production, requiring a separate exhibition with varieties all along from Virginia round to Kansas. [Laughter.] If our States are required to send effigies of their great men to fill our niches in this Capitol, why should not our Paris exposition glory in distinct scarecrows from every one of our free and independent

States? Why not, under favoring conditions, show the silky fringes of the inchoate corn (is not France the land of silk?) and the roasting ear, ready for the youngster's larceny and the family succotash? Why not, as an addition to the zoölogical exhibition, export the sly 'coon and nimble squirrel, enriching their stores like drones or lobby-ists from honest toil? [Laughter.] Why limit the exhibition to cookery, which the French so well understand?

HUSKING.

Let there be a corn-shucking on the Trocadéro, when the ear is full ripe for the harvest; then let the bursting corn arise upon the banks of the Seine, aloof from the incursive rat and the waters' flow. Then, O, joy! let us show the world the old-fashioned husking, before machinery depoetized the rustic frolic. What a reformatory sight in bad, luxurious Paris! Would that it were permitted the Foreign Affairs Committee to take part in it, with its grave but festive chairman. [Laughter.] How happy to be surrounded by the attractive grisettes and coquettish lorettes, or mayhap by the wooden-shod peasant girls of sweet Normandy by the sea, assisted of course by my colleague as chief interpreter. [Laughter.] I think I see these gentle nymphs of Paris, in a beautiful circle, aiding us to tear off the dry envelope from the golden ear, while the song of Lord Lovell, who went far countries for to see, accompanied by sweet cider, passes around! My honored chairman [Mr. SWANN] is in their midst. [Laughter.] Shall I omit my colleague [Mr. HEWITT] from the charmed circle? [Laughter.] I should love to be with them [laughter] when the gentle usage begins. Delicious custom! But never more so than when, with scream and titter, some lucky maiden cries, "*La rouge! la rouge!*" I have found the red ear!" Would my honored chairman be reluctant? Suppose a dark eyed maid of Marseilles had a red ear—would he be reluctant? [Laughter.] If he were, would not my colleague take his place? [Laughter.] He would. Would my colleague with modest grace shrink from the penalty which follows? [Great laughter, during which Mr. HEWITT kissed his hand to his colleague.] Would not Ceres be dethroned for another goddess: *Hominum, divumque voluptas*? I hear my colleague sigh. [Laughter.] Methinks I hear the merry demoiselle crying "*Embrassez-moi, cher monsieur; embrassez-moi!*" [Great confusion and laughter.] Would he, could he, refuse the proffered kiss? [Laughter.] And if perchance the red ear fell to the ingenious inventor of this "maizy" plan—without giving way for a reply—I ask him now and here, would he carry out the custom and kiss the reluctant maids all around? If he will say he would, then there is no need of further appropriation. [Laughter.] It will pay for itself! [Great laughter.]

FRENCH COOKERY TO BE IMPROVED.

What, carry cookery to Paris! Why a French cook spends a life on a single dish. The French are sensitive to the least aberration in cookery. It is known that the great Vattel exclaimed: "The roast has failed at two tables." He retired to his room in vexation and expired. Is it possible that we can teach such a fastidious people to eat mush and pone? If this kitchen is intended to punish France by giving it a universal colic on green corn, I can understand it. Is my colleague to be allowed to wreak his disappointments in America on a people not responsible for the returning board of Louisiana, or the inauguration of President Hayes? Sir, such motives should not influence legislation.

SOCIAL SCIENCE VIEW OF A CORN KITCHEN.

But perhaps my colleague has humanitarian ends in view. He would rescue France from wild propensities, social freedom, and sensual gratification. But will corn or its essence do it? Will the wanderer in the Prada, the Rue Saint Honoré, and the Salle Victorie, saloons of which the quadroom balls of New Orleans are mere shadows—be reclaimed by corn? It is said that France is degenerating, its births falling off, its population decreasing. Eureka! I have the idea. I find it from Barlow's muse. He tells us in poetic measure how his father loved mush, what vigor he had: that ten sturdy freemen from his loins attested it; that all his own bones were made of Indian corn. [Laughter.]

IDIOSYNCRASIES OF EXHIBITORS.

Some applications to other exhibitions were as odd as is this corn-kitchen contrivance. An eccentric applicant desired to exhibit a flying-machine under the great dome at London, in 1852. Had he succeeded he would have shot out through the costly glass cupola. Another proposed to exhibit an epic poem in the picture-gallery. An eight-foot giant dressed in the time of Henry IV was offered as an usher; a gardener proposed improvements in surgical implements; a doctor, a contrivance to ripen fruits; a grocer, a new projectile for heavy ordnance; a Cambridge student, a floating-battery; an accountant, an omnitonic flute; a lawyer, spring-heel boots, [laughter;] a book-binder, an interminable suspension bridge; a broker, a new kind of embroidery; a private secretary, gooseberry-wine; a gentleman, a turn-up bedstead for a shoemaker; a member of Parliament, a patent moustache-guard with protection from soup, [laughter;] and a Frenchman presented an exalted affinity or homogeneous equilibrium of individual *unité* affected through its constituent atoms by a chemical combination with a reduction of the pretended simple element, returned to the primitive root. [Great laughter.] Then why should not my amiable bucolic colleague, so experienced in iron and electoral commissions, follow these many precedents and present at the congregation of the nations a *cuisine* redolent with this life-giving, life-supporting, all-soul-reviving, luscious cereal, and spread its merits in foreign tongues to the uninformed peoples of the world! Where, O, where, would Colonel Sellers be with his famous eye-water for the four hundred millions of double-eyed Asiatics or his wonderful corner in corn? He fades before this all-comprehensive project.

But while we may commend this great and beneficent idea, always supposing that it can be accomplished without an appropriation, must we not look at its possible impediments and reception? For if this arrangement is made, one thing must be provided in the mushroom-and-milk department. Barlow sings it in his "Hasty-Pudding." There must be a different spoon from that of Gaul, which was contrived to scoop in ample draughts the thin diluted soup. In attracting the French peasant from his black bread and thin wine, his *soupe maigre* and indigestible truffles, we must adjust the cutlery to the food and the food to the cutlery; and this will require a new tariff. Besides, this forced installation of our Ceres may meet with resistance—doubtless will—and I shudder at the prospective conflict; for has not the experiment been tried once before, when America, in closest sympathy with Ireland's suffering masses, offered her corn, and was most ignominiously repulsed by the expected recipients? So, I fear, may be the result of our corn mission! They will conceive it to be another of our force measures and resist.

MAGNITUDE OF THE CORN INVASION.

Sir, Russia invades Turkey to force Christianity into the Moslem conscience, and Turkey turns the tide of war against the invader in defense of her suzerainty.

The world stands on tiptoe, *erectis auribus*, looking toward Ararat and the deluge of blood along the blue Danube, waiting the result of this momentous conflict of the ages. But, sir, Russia and Turkey, with their embattling hosts, present no such array as will be that of the terrific onslaught of my colleague in the great corn invasion of the nineteenth century. [Laughter.] It outrivals Don Quixote, who, in his hallucination, charged with all his chivalry, upon a flock of sheep, with not less discretion and no greater love for the simple shepherds and their flocks than for the knightly regard he had for his fair Dulcinea *cuisinière*. But, sir, he did it without any other appropriation than that furnished by poor Sancho's wallet! [Laughter.]

UNFETTERED AND UNSUBSIDIZED TRADE.

Seriously, Mr. Speaker, almost every element of American industry and manufacturing, under private enterprise will find its proper market in Europe. I have seen the Maid of Saragossa, in Spain, "trip the light fantastic toe" upon the treadle of our sewing-machines; our agricultural implements have their agencies throughout Europe. The five hundred million dollars' worth of petitioners as they saunter through the avenues of Paris or under the lindens of Berlin are not always so much at leisure but that they can keep an eye to business. Our grains will go wherever there is a demand for them, for life depends on them. Under proper reciprocity our wheat exports to Great Britain might double in one year their sixty millions without an appropriation. The exportation of American watches, superior to the Swiss, already has an enlarged market without an appropriation. Our whiskies and high wines are indispensable to give additional strength to the wines of Bordeaux, Oporto, and Xeres. The gentleman from Connecticut, my friend, (Mr. LANDERS,) has already sent his cutlery to Sheffield without an appropriation and in spite of restriction. American cottons will find their way beyond the barriers of China and Japan, along with our sewing-machines. It is well, sir, to have a flag to cover an appropriation; sometimes the flag without the appropriation may be better.

Mr. Speaker, I say it with all respect to the gentlemen who favor this measure, with the five hundred millions of capital which back it, that not one man truly representative of labor would ever be selected under its provisions. It is intended to help the men of velvet paws who would, if they could, displace the simplicity of our habits by the luxury of Heliogabalus. If the nine acres of carpeting in the Treasury Department were confiscated, it would enable our Parisian voluptuaries who favor the Napoleonic dynasty in their colony at Paris to visit that other exhibition, the Jardin Mabille, and dance the can-can after a plentiful consumption of American corn. Is it not enough for us to throw over this exhibition the mutuality of our courtesy and the ægis of our Government, without sending bounties to the five-hundred-million-dollar petitioners who come to Congress for help?

FOREIGN MARKETS—HOW TO GET THEM.

The war going on in the Orient will do more for mere material America than all the palaces dedicated so ostentatiously to peace. Guns, drums, trumpets, blunderbusses, and thunder, with a plentiful supply of breadstuffs, will open our trade and give us markets. There

is always a good from an ill. Wholesome berries thrive and ripen best, neighbored by fruits of baser quality. War may hurt some, while it helps others. There is a growing demand daily for all we produce really needed abroad. To increase that demand, legislation is necessary; but not of this kind. These expositions have been used to destroy our industries through selfish tariff exactions. Who helped will appear in the quotations I will make presently.

EXPOSITIONS USED TO PROPAGATE PROTECTION.

The Paris exposition had a report by the author of the present bill upon the production of iron and steel in its economic and social relations, by ABRAM S. HEWITT, United States commissioner. Was that in the interest of the workingmen? Doubtless it was so intended, and it reads very plausibly. It showed great familiarity with the ores, with girders, plates and rods, and processes of manufacture and qualities of different materials in Europe. It had also an appendix in relation to Bessamer steel, to which I will refer directly in an interesting connection. In that report were described, with great skill and power of analysis, specimens of material, machinery, and processes of manufacture which differ substantially from the experience of the United States. This was interesting, and might have been collected by any intelligent person, with the payment of a thousand dollars, and without an exposition. An honorary commissioner had the *entrée* of all the factories and mines of Europe, without a salary. But the glory and genius of this report was not so much its differential statement and its elaborate collection of facts as its discussion of protective and restrictive legislation. Granting all the good objects and intentions of the author as to the working classes, no one can mistake the meaning of his conclusion on page 60, where he says:

It is scarcely possible longer to deny that the first step toward securing to the working classes an adequate reward for their labor is such legislation as protects them from the evils which seem to be inseparable from unrestrained competition between nations and men, which experience has shown to result in the utter disregard of the moral and physical condition and welfare of the working classes, unless regulated by positive and legal enactment.

It cannot be denied, therefore, that one of the results of the Paris exposition, in so far as iron and steel were concerned, was the propagation of the idea that we can impose such a duty on foreign iron as will make up for the difference in the amount of wages paid for making a ton of iron in Europe and this country, less the expense of transportation. The author of this essay based his tariff notions on the old fallacy of the wages of labor, and thus a dead school of economy was attempted to be revived by an American commissioner.

Another illustration of the covert way in which protectionists have used these exhibitions to further their selfish interests is found in another report from Paris in 1867. I call attention especially on the article on wool and its manufacture, in which everything is turned in favor of our vicious tariff system. Doubtless the same thing can be found in other reports. I am told that the Centennial reports are full of this obsolete protective nonsense. From these few extracts we may learn all. After showing that the greater cost of fabricating cloths in this country is not owing to any want of natural advantages, nor any deficiency in skill or labor, the partisan commissioner denies, "that the manufacture is sustained only by artificial stimulus and rendering its productions as unnatural, to use Adam Smith's often quoted comparison, as that of wine produced from grapes grown in the greenhouses of Scotland."

He further says:

Having placed ourselves upon an equality with other nations in enterprise and skill, our power of unaided competition has reached its limit, and our woolen industry could not sustain itself in competition with foreign production unless placed upon an equality in the command of capital, or unless the disparity against us were neutralized by legislative provisions. It is only to neutralize the foreign advantages of cheap capital and labor that protective, or, more properly speaking, *defensive*, duties are demanded by the woolen manufacturers. The duties on wool paid by the manufacturer, and theoretically re-imbursed by the specific duties on the cloth, are demanded by the American wool-growers for the same reason. We speak only for our own industry, and with respect to that it is asserted with the utmost confidence that every spindle and loom employed in it would be stopped by the breaking down of the defensive barriers existing in tariff legislation.

The success of our domestic woolen industry thus becomes identified with our agricultural prosperity. Such considerations would seem to place it beyond all question that our national interests require that we should repel the cheap fabrics of Europe, even at considerable sacrifice, that we may appropriate for ourselves the labor and profit of their production.

UNRESTRAINED COMPETITION.

To a large portion of this House it is unnecessary to show that unrestrained competition is inseparable from liberty of trade between nations and men. It is useless now to argue that cheap iron and clothing are of the utmost use to our people. Nor is it necessary to show, as to this measure, that if competition be restrained the exposition of the labor of different nations and their products and raw material is an expensive and tantalizing sham.

FRENCH AND AMERICAN TARIFFS.

Gentlemen should consider in this connection the French tariff as well as our own, and its bearing on the Paris exhibition. What effect will it have upon any prospective trade or export to that country? Here will be found the reasons for the adverse action of the German government, and not any national prejudice. Why do we export so little to France? Except tobacco, a few barrels, petroleum, and cotton, we have but a limited trade. France reciprocates with England through the Cobden and Chevalier treaty of mutuality. It was of reciprocal advantage. France treats us as we do her. It is mutual brigandage to both peoples through our tariffs. They buy tobacco of us because it is better and cheaper than elsewhere; and they obtain it even cheaper than our own citizens, because they buy in larger quantities. Our barrels are returned to us full of decoctions of logwood, &c.; and they buy petroleum because they cannot buy elsewhere. Here is another example: Take this little folding-scissors, which I would like the ladies in the galleries to see. It was invented and made here and patented in France. The patentees were expecting and preparing for large sales during the Exhibition. Looking for the charges of duties, they find them marked with cutlery "*prohibée*," and this word is the cause of our small exports to that country, for just those goods which we export everywhere are either prohibited or taxed so heavily as to work the same as prohibition. So is cast-iron, iron-work, nails, screws, &c., leather, manufactures of paper, cotton yarns and manufactures of cotton, soap, perfumery, and hundreds of other articles prohibited. Let the question be fully understood. The French nation is looked upon as so friendly to us that to refuse them would seem ungrateful and uncourteous. But what advantage can we derive from exhibiting goods which we cannot sell nor export to France? It would be like exhibiting to Dives the glories of Paradise; or to a thirsty army, a mirage of cool streams. The articles shown and exhibited which really please will simply be copied; for no one can import them: they are "*Prohibée*." Who, then, gains by the exposition of them?

BURDENS ON LABOR BY TARIFFS.

But, sir, as most of the burdens upon our laboring-men have come upon them because of the indirect protective bounties mostly levied upon labor, is it not easy to see that the production of such reports as those from which I have quoted is the result of a selfish and unscientific economy?

CENTENNIAL PROPHECIES AND THEIR FAILURE.

When the Centennial was before Congress, my sanguine colleague who has introduced this measure, considered that the Centennial would be a paying investment. It would put our own money into rapid circulation; it would help our railways, hotels and shops; re-open the channels of business, not to be clogged again with the *debris* of another financial convulsion. Labor would no longer stand idle, consuming without producing; the country would feel better; confidence would be restored; and the enterprise and energies of our people once more assert themselves in opening new highways of communication.

It would be the resurrection of industry; new and suggestive ideas would be aroused; foreign capital would be attracted hither; we should be able to negotiate our new loans at the lowest rate, raising our credit to a level with that of Great Britain. A heavy annual burden of taxation upon productive industries would be removed, and a thousand other rhetorical blessings were promised, which came to pass in the most severely ironical manner. Under such specious and pleasant prospects we gave \$600,000 to the Centennial; and, in addition, there was an act of June 1, 1872, (17 Statutes, 203,) in which it was provided that the appropriation of \$1,500,000, made by the act of February 16, 1876, (19 Statutes, 3,) must be paid into the Treasury of the United States before any division of assets should be made among the stockholders in satisfaction and discharge of the capital stock. And the Supreme Court decided (Otto, 505) that Congress did not intend by the act of 1876 to change the order of distribution as provided by that of 1872.

How the Centennial itself paid its promoters, and its peculiar attempt to hold on to the million and a half which we had only *loaned*, and to make the United States not a preferred but a common creditor, eventuated, the decision of Judge Waite amply illustrates. It is but another example of how the bounty of this Government is treated by men of large capital and unbounded infidelity to their engagements.

WHAT LESSONS THE CENTENNIAL TEACHES.

Besides, does not our Centennial teach us other lessons? Not that British gold was used there to corrupt our statesmen to favor British interests; for I believe my friend from Pennsylvania, Judge KELLEY, was the only recipient of British gold, for he rented his house to the British commission! But the farce of inviting the world to show off with us in competition here where every article has its tariff of restriction or prohibition! It was regarded as the sublimity of absurdity.

General Walker, in the *International Review* for July-August, 1877, gives these pertinent reasons why there was a comparatively poor show at the Centennial of foreign goods. I quote:

A cause which importantly affected the commercial interest of Europe in the display of products at Philadelphia, to the injury of the exhibition, was the high tariff maintained by the United States; a tariff which, within many lines of production, is intended to be, and is, prohibitory. Such a tariff, equally whether its effect upon our domestic industry has been good or bad, must, in the nature of the case,

have impaired, where it did not destroy, the interest which foreign producers and dealers might otherwise have felt in the display of their wares.

When it is considered how short is our free list, how high the grade of duties—the average impost on dutiable articles being in 1875, 40.6 per cent., 50, 60, and 70 per cent. being not uncommon, and 80 and even 90 per cent not unknown—it must appear how different an exhibition at Philadelphia under such a *régime* inevitably would be from one held in a country inviting foreign competition within its markets.

While the effect of the tariff was thus to cut in at a hundred places upon the Exhibition it especially affected the display of silk and woolen goods. The gratulations so frequently expressed over the American exhibit were measurably justified if placed on the ground of the progress made in these branches of manufacture and the really high degree of excellence attained in many lines of production. But when our boasting took the form of alleging that foreign countries showed in this line or in that line nothing to surpass or to equal the products of American mills, we were justly rebuked by a reference to our tariff, which imposes duties on articles of silk or of wool rising, on a large part of our importation, to 60 per cent., and in many cases reaching 80 and 90 per cent.

The average duty collected in 1875 on the druggets and bockings imported was 96 per cent.; on many grades of flannel 80 and 90 per cent.; on velvets and shawls of silk, and on all non-enumerated articles of the same material, the duty was 60 per cent.; on Brussels carpets made by the Jacquard machinery between 60 and 65 per cent.

LARGER CONSUMPTION.

Mr. Speaker, if we would assist our industries, enlarge our market, and attract with all our forces, social and political, other people to our shores, let us repeal these absurd and repellant policies. Let us avoid giving bounties to a selfish class. If we want an outlet for our productions, let us enlarge the sphere of consumption. If we will make an alliance of physical with intellectual force, and lift the hierarchy of labor into a higher plane; if we would extend the hand of fellowship to other nations, we have something more to do than to create a simple display of goods upon a stall in a foreign land. What avails a public *fête* or show, with a Chinese wall placed round our own country by restrictive legislation. Take the duties off our fifteen hundred taxable articles, and you have a market with all the world. You withdraw the veil which hangs over our industries, and make America itself a universal exhibition. We want no edifices of iron and glass to give impetus to manufactures. Your enchantment to provoke improvement and increase of manufactures is a cheap market, not merely for your manufactures, but for your breadstuffs. Liberalities in exchange bring together the skillful manufacturer and the cheap transporter. What France and England did by reciprocity, we may do. No palatial prodigies like the Crystal Palace or the *Ausstellung Alla* are half so potent as a cheap market. It is the lamp of Aladdin. It accomplishes miracles, saves from revolution and distress, and destitution and poverty, and despair and death.

Man has made his railways upon the earth, the sea has become an economical means of transit through steam; there is no quest, even to the uttermost parts of the earth, in which our enterprise may not go with the cheap market. If isolated, with all our pre-eminence in industry, with all our power to create motion in matter—we fail. Our mines may give us silver and gold, our valleys maize and wheat, war may take from the fields of labor its millions of men in other lands, we may know what Carlyle said when he sang of tools and the man, and the power of the dwarf behind the engine to remove mountains; but all is of no avail without an outlet for our products. Governments may give bounties, as Napoleon did, for the substitution of flax for cotton to destroy the commerce of a neighbor, but the restricting invention returns to plague the inventor. The active, free-trading nation will become enriched thereby. We may have the

process by which steel is made in great retorts by the ton, the refinements of the spectroscope, but at last the genii that wait upon the magic ring of prosperity enter the unrestrained and cheap market. In vain legislators! do ye endeavor to oppose the designs of Providence, for the order of God is *freedom of exchange*!

BUY, IF YOU WOULD SELL.

When this country, by a series of insane tariffs, sought to exclude the merchandise of other nations, it did not grow rich. When England, in 1846, repealed her corn laws, she made a new commercial system that gave her the exchanges of the world. Maine cannot sell her timber abroad with a tariff which taxes the salt for her fish. Illinois cannot find as good a market for her teeming granaries in the Old World when she stops the fabrics of England and France. If we would sell our machines and grains to France, we must buy her olive oil and silk. The rule has no exception. You cannot make a bargain without two parties. There is no sale without a purchase. Can you sell to one without receiving from him and expect to remain solvent? Try to sell abroad without purchasing abroad and you will make a failure, and a failure more absurd than any which Bastiat demonstrates or China once illustrated.

WELCOME TO ALL.

It is not in expositions, in subsidies, that our limitless prairies and abounding forests, or our commercial and manufacturing greatness will attract the overpopulated countries of the Old World. Let America open her arms to the hungry and the hopeless, and bid the homeless come over sea and land. Let them delve in our mines, plow in our soil. We have air, and water, and bread, and gold and silver, riches, happiness, and labor for all who come. Only there stands in the path the one gaunt specter of selfish and unmitigated greed through legislation. The first step to be taken by the American Congress for the revival and prosperity of our country is freedom of trade without the folly of shackling it. Therefore let our appeal to the world be made: *Ad nos ad salutarum undam, venite, populi*. [Applause.]

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 945 819 A

Conservation Resources
Lig-Free® Type I
Ph 8.5, Buffered

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS



0 019 945 819 A